

REMARKS

1 Claims 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by
Gerd-Albrecht (DE 196 47 515 A1). It is the Examiner's contention that Gerd-Albrecht
discloses a method of mounting a wind turbine comprising the steps of claims 4 and 6.
5 Although claims 4 and 6 were believed to be allowable, all of the claims in the
application have been cancelled without prejudice with new claim 7 having been
substituted therefore. Claim 7 is believed to be allowable over Gerd-Albrecht. Claim 7
specifically describes that the wind turbine support is transported to the tower by means
of a wheeled vehicle. Claim 7 further describes that the wind turbine support is then
10 mounted on the tower and that a wind turbine is positioned on the wind turbine support.
Further, claim 7 describes that the wind turbine support and the wind turbine are
winched upwardly with respect to the tower to the upper end thereof. Claim 7
additionally describes that the wind turbine support is winched downwardly with respect
15 to the tower after the wind turbine has been secured to the upper end of the tower.
Additionally, claim 7 describes that the wind turbine support is removed from the tower
and placed on the wheeled vehicle which then transports the support to another tower
for use thereon.

20 To the best of applicant's understanding, Gerd-Albrecht does not position a wind
turbine on a wind turbine support. Further, Gerd-Albrecht does not winch the wind
turbine support having the wind turbine thereon to the upper end of the tower nor does
Gerd-Albrecht disclose that the wind turbine support is winched downwardly to the lower

end of the tower after the wind turbine has been secured to the upper end of the tower.

1 Therefore, Gerd-Albrecht cannot possibly anticipate claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Abe (US
4,311,434). Abe fails to anticipate the structure of claim 7 for the reasons stated in the
5 previous Amendment with respect to claims 4-6. Abe further cannot be construed as
anticipating claim 7 since there is no teaching in Abe that a wind turbine support could
be transported to the tower by means of a wheeled vehicle and transported to another
tower for use thereon by means of the wheeled vehicle. As stated in the previous
Amendment, while Abe suggests that the platform may be removed, it is believed that
10 the same is not possible due to the relationship of the collars and tubular supports as
previously discussed.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is requested to enter the Amendment and
to allow claim 7. In the event that the Examiner does not allow claim 7, it is requested
15 that the Amendment be entered for purposes of appeal.

Respectfully submitted,



DENNIS L. THOMTE
Registration No. 22,497
THOMTE, MAZOUR & NIEBERGALL
Attorneys of Record

Suite 1111, 2120 S. 72nd St.
Omaha, NE 68124
(402) 392-2280